

cussion to a close I move the previous question; and upon that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question being taken the result was, yeas 16, nays 45, as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Davis, of Washington, Ecker, Hatch, Hopkins, Jones, of Cecil, McComas, Mullikin, Noble, Nyman, Robinette, Sneary and Swope—16.

*Nays*—Messrs. Barron, Bond, Brown, Chambers, Cunningham, Cushing, Dail, Davis, of Charles, Dennis, Duvall, Earle, Farrow, Galloway, Greene, Hebb, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, Keefer, Kennard, King, Larsh, Mace, Markey, Mitchell, Miller, Morgan, Negley, Parker, Parran, Peter, Pugh, Sands, Schlosser, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Dorchester, Smith, of Worcester, Stirling, Stockbridge, Sykes, Thruston, Todd, Valliant, Wickard and Wooden—45.

As their names were called, the following members explained their votes:

Mr. BARRON. I cannot vote as I would wish on this question, because as I have said, I want to hear this question discussed to its full extent. I would vote to extend our sessions from six in the morning until midnight that every member wishing to speak may be accommodated; but upon this question I must vote—no.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to closing the discussion as soon as possible; but I think the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Audoun) has not been here to know how far this discussion has gone. If he had been here I think he would have wanted to hear it all. I vote—no.

Mr. THRUSTON. I shall vote in the negative because I think it is due to the chairman of the committee to close the discussion, that he may have an opportunity to reply to the arguments upon the other side, some of which have been directed almost personally towards him. I will vote for the motion when the chairman shall have had an opportunity to express his views. At present I vote—no.

So the motion for the previous question did not prevail.

Mr. MILLER. This debate has taken a very wide range. I do not propose, nor would the allotted hour permit me to follow gentlemen into all the matter which they have seen fit to discuss. I shall not, therefore, debate with the gentleman from Howard whether any band of southern

men ever offered to bribe Mr. Clay into consenting to a scheme for the opening of the African slave-trade, nor dispute with him about the secret history of the annexation of Texas. Neither shall I imitate the gentleman from Washington by heaping harsh epithets upon the men who now administer or at any past time have administered the General Government, nor shall I enter with the gentleman from Baltimore city into an inquiry whether in this sad war in which the country is now engaged, more cruelty has been practiced by the Federal or Confederate armies. All these matters I consider outside of the legitimate and logical discussion of the subject under consideration.

The subject before us, sir, is of the gravest importance, and demands at our hands cool, calm and dispassionate reasoning. In it is involved an inquiry into the nature and character of the system of government under which we *are living*. We are here to frame a Constitution for the State of Maryland, a permanent organic law, which is to continue not simply during this terrible civil strife, but as we hope during better and happier times when the dark cloud of war shall have passed away and the blessings of peace be once more restored to us.

We are here considering what relation the people of this State sustain not only to the Constitution, laws and government of the United States, but also to the people of other States, for our action now on this question, will not only affect ourselves, but will inevitably have its influence upon the people of neighboring States. It becomes us then to measure well the ground we are standing upon. We must remember that the instrument we are dealing with is the Constitution of the United States, and if the step we are now asked to take—this headlong rush into the vortex of consolidation, and the total overthrow of State rights and State sovereignty—should result, as Patrick Henry prophesied it would, in the overthrow of American constitutional liberty, and the erection upon its ruins of a despotic or imperial form of government, we cannot justify it to our consciences, that we did it under the pressure of circumstances, and because we could see no other way out of our present troubles. That plea will furnish us no justification. We have no right "to inaugurate a revolution in order to put down a rebellion."

I shall now proceed to give as briefly as I can, the views which I entertain upon